IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)
Plaintiff,))
v.) Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-GKF-PJC
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,))
Defendants) 3.)

STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S MOTION FOR A TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS CONDUCT OF JULY 28-29, 2009 *DAUBERT* HEARING

Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma ("the State") respectfully requests a telephonic status conference at the Court's earliest convenience to discuss the conduct of the July 28-29, 2009 *Daubert* hearing. Among the issues the State would like to discuss at the status conference are (1) organizing the various *Daubert* motions filed by the two sides into subject-matter groupings; (2) if the various *Daubert* motions are organized into subject-matter groupings, the order in which those groupings will be heard; and (3) the presentation of live testimony at the *Daubert* hearing. The State has conferred with Defendants, and Defendants have no objection to a status conference (although it is the State's understanding that they do object to certain of the State's proposals as to how the *Daubert* hearing should be conducted).

I. Legal Standard

It is well established that Fed. R. Evid. 702 imposes on a district court a gatekeeper obligation to ensure that expert testimony be not only relevant, but reliable. *See Dodge v. Cotter Corp.*, 328 F.3d 1212, 1221 (10th Cir. 2003). "Though the district court has discretion in how it conducts the gatekeeper function, we have recognized that it has no discretion to avoid

performing the gatekeeper function." Id. at 1223 (emphasis in original). The Tenth Circuit has explained:

A natural requirement of the gatekeeper function is the creation of "a sufficiently developed record in order to allow a determination of whether the district court properly applied the relevant law." Goebel, 215 F.3d at 1087; see also Dodge I, 203 F.3d at 1200 n.12 (urging the district court on remand to "vigilantly make detailed findings to fulfill the gatekeeper role crafted in Daubert" to ensure that each "particular opinion is based on valid reasoning and reliable methodology"). In Velarde, we observed that "Kumho and Daubert make it clear that the [district] court must, on the record, make some kind of reliability determination." 214 F.3d at 1209. Thus, we held in Goebel that when faced with a party's objection, a district court "must adequately demonstrate by specific findings on the record that it has performed its duty as gatekeeper." 215 F.3d at 1088 (emphasis added).

Id. (emphasis in original).

The Northern District of Oklahoma has on previous occasions allowed Daubert motions to be organized into groupings. See, e.g., Herd v. Asarco, Inc., 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27380, *18-19 (N.D. Okla. May 28, 2003). Additionally, the Northern District of Oklahoma has on previous occasions allowed the presentation of live testimony at Daubert hearings. See id. at *19. In fact, in reviewing the adequacy of the procedures used by the trial court in Dodge, the Tenth Circuit found cause to comment on the refusal of a trial court to accept live testimony from experts in a *Daubert* hearing:

The important issue here is the aggregate effect of several of the district court's decisions. Initially, the court limited the length of any Daubert brief and appendix to 20 pages. Aplt. App. Though the court was put on notice of specific challenges to certain experts' methodology and reasoning, it insisted on the exclusive use of argument and proffers at the *Daubert* hearing instead of meaningful live witness testimony. Although a detailed, in-depth hearing addressing disputed reasoning and methodologies was critical to a proper resolution of the entire case, the Daubert hearing lasted just over four hours and allowed for little more than a cursory review of the contested issues. The court itself proved this point by asking questions of counsel that only the expert could realistically answer.

Dodge, 328 F.3d at 1228.

II. The State's Proposal

There are 21 *Daubert* motions before the Court. *See* DKT #2028 (Harwood), #2056 (Engel), #2058 (Churchill), #2059 (Grip), #2060 (McGuire), #2061 (Clay), #2063 (Bierman), #2064 (Davis), #2067 (Teaf), #2068 (King), #2071 (Sullivan), #2072 (Cowan), #2074 (Murphy), #2078 (Taylor), #2082 (Olsen), #2083 (Johnson), #2090 (Bacterial Holding Times and Analysis), #2242 (Evaluation of CV Remediation Strategy), #2263 (Payne), #2270 (Desvousges / Rausser), #2272 (Stratus). A number of these motions share common or related subject matters - *e.g.*, watershed modeling, bacteria / PCR biomarker, PCA, disinfection by-products / water quality / risk assessment, and contingent valuation. As such, the State proposes that the motions be topically grouped and ordered in the following manner:

July 28, 2009

- 1. Watershed Modeling: DKT #2063 (Bierman) & #2056 (Engel)
- Bacteria / PCR Biomarker: DKT #2028 (Harwood) & #2090 (Bacterial Holding Times and Analysis)
- 3. DKT #2059 (Grip)
- 4. DKT #2064 (Davis)
- 5. DKT #2061 (Clay)
- 6. DKT #2058 (Churchill)

July 29, 2009

- 1. Principle Component Analysis (PCA): #2072 (Cowan), #2074 (Murphy), #2082 (Olsen) & #2083 (Johnson)
- Disinfection By-Products / Water Quality / Risk Assessment: #2060 (McGuire),
 #2067 (Teaf) & #2071 (Sullivan)

- Contingent Valuation Study: #2242 (Evaluation of CV Remediation Strategy),
 #2270 (Desvousges / Rausser) & #2272 (Stratus)
- 4. #2263 (Payne)
- 5. #2068 (King)

A number of these motions involve complex scientific and technical issues. Clearly, where such complex scientific and technical issues are involved, live testimony from experts can help the court in performing its gatekeeper function. *See Dodge*, 328 F.3d at 1228. Specifically, the State would like to present live testimony by Dr. Engel on watershed modeling issues, Dr. Harwood on PCR biomarker issues and on bacterial holding times and analysis issues, Dr. Sadowksy on PCR biomarker issues, Dr. Olsen on PCA issues, Dr. Loftis on PCA issues, Dr. Teaf on disinfection by-products / water quality / risk assessment issues, and Dr. Hanemann on issues pertaining to the State's contingent valuation study.

The State submits that the preceding grouping and ordering of the *Daubert* motions, together with live testimony by the experts identified above, present an efficient and fair method of addressing these motions.

III. Conclusion

WHEREFORE, in light of the foregoing, the State's motion for a telephonic status conference at the Court's earliest convenience to discuss the conduct of the July 28-29, 2009 *Daubert* hearing should be granted, and the State's proposal for the conduct of the *Daubert* hearing should be adopted.

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA # 2628 ATTORNEY GENERAL Kelly H. Burch OBA #17067 ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL State of Oklahoma 313 N.E. 21st St. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

/s/ David P. Page

M. David Riggs OBA #7583
Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371
Richard T. Garren OBA #3253
Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010
Robert A. Nance OBA #6581
D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641
David P. Page OBA #6852
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN,
ORBISON & LEWIS
502 West Sixth Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
(918) 587-3161

Louis W. Bullock OBA #1305 Robert M. Blakemore OBA 18656 BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE 110 West Seventh Street Suite 707 Tulsa OK 74119 (918) 584-2001

Frederick C. Baker (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth C. Ward (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth Claire Xidis (admitted *pro hac vice*)
MOTLEY RICE, LLC
28 Bridgeside Boulevard
Mount Pleasant, SC 29465 (843) 216-9280

William H. Narwold (admitted pro hac vice) Ingrid L. Moll (admitted pro hac vice) MOTLEY RICE, LLC 20 Church Street, 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 882-1676

Jonathan D. Orent (admitted *pro hac vice*) Michael G. Rousseau (admitted *pro hac vice*) Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE, LLC 321 South Main Street Providence, RI 02940 (401) 457-7700

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 13th day of July, 2009, I electronically transmitted the above and foregoing pleading to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and a transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

	C 1 1 (C)
W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General	fc_docket@oag.state.ok.us
Kelly H. Burch, Assistant Attorney General	kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us
M. David Riggs	driggs@riggsabney.com
Joseph P. Lennart	jlennart@riggsabney.com
Richard T. Garren	rgarren@riggsabney.com
Sharon K. Weaver	sweaver@riggsabney.com
Robert A. Nance	rnance@riggsabney.com
D. Sharon Gentry	sgentry@riggsabney.com
David P. Page	dpage@riggsabney.com
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON &	& LEWIS
Louis Werner Bullock	lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com
Robert M. Blakemore	bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com
BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE	
Frederick C. Baker	fbaker@motleyrice.com

Charles L. Moulton, Sr Assistant Attorney General

Charles.Moulton@arkansasag.gov

Counsel for State of Arkansas and Arkansas National Resources Commission	
Mark Richard Mullins	richard.mullins@mcafeetaft.com
MCAFEE & TAFT	
Counsel for Texas Farm Bureau; Texas Cattle F	eeders Association; Texas Pork Producers
Association and Texas Association of Dairymen	
Mia Vahlberg	mvahlberg@gablelaw.com
GABLE GOTWALS	
James T. Banks	jtbanks@hhlaw.com
Adam J. Siegel	ajsiegel@hhlaw.com
HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP	djsteger(djimaw.com
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pou	ltry and Egg Association & National Turkey
Federation	
John D. Russell	irussell@fellerssnider.com
FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY	Ji dissell (Wiellerssill der teolir
& TIPPENS, PC	
& HFFENS, FC	
William A. Waddell, Jr.	waddell@fec.net
David E. Choate	dchoate@fec.net
FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP	
Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation	
Dawn, Grag Daynalds	reynolds@titushillis.com
Barry Greg Reynolds Jessica E. Rainey	jrainey@titushillis.com
TITUS, HILLIS, REYNOLDS, LOVE,	James Williams
DICKMAN & MCCALMON	
DICKIMEN & MCCALLINON	
Nikaa Baugh Jordan	njordan@lightfootlaw.com
William S. Cox, III	wcox@lightfootlaw.com
LIGHTFOOT, FRANKLIN & WHITE, LLC	
Counsel for American Farm Bureau and Nation	al Cattlemen's Beef Association
Duane L. Berlin	dberlin@levberlin.com
LEV & BERLIN PC	dominio, or
Counsel for Council of American Survey Resear	ch Organizations & American Association for
Public Opinion Research	VA CAMMENTALINA OF TAMES INCOME.
A WOME O PHINING ALBOOMS ON	

Also on this 13th day of July, 2009 I mailed a copy of the above and foregoing pleading to:

Thomas C Green -- via email: tcgreen@sidley.com Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood LLP

Dustin McDaniel Justin AllenOffice of the Attorney General (Little Rock)
323 Center St, Ste 200
Little Rock, AR 72201-2610

Steven B. Randall, Esq 58185 County Rd 658 Kansas, Ok 74347

Cary Silverman -- via email: csilverman@shb.com Victor E Schwartz Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP (Washington DC)

/s/ David P. Page